UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,747	12/19/2003	Gary Karlin Michelson	102.0001-12000	4978
			EXAM	INER
10/740,747 12/19/2003 Gary Karlin Michelson	BROWN, MICHAEL A			
HARTVILLE,	OH 44032		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3772	
			~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	Application No.		•
Office Action Summan	10/740,747	MICHELSON, GA	ARY KARLIN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Brown	3772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY TO BE A STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY TO BE A STATE OF THE MAILING IDENTIFY THE MAILIN	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	1	
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Thi	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to th	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1 and 10-31 is/are pending in the ap	plication.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 10-18 is/are v	withdrawn from considerati	on.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19-31</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			•
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 (	CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form F	TO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documer			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prices of the pri	·	received in this Nationa	ii Stage
application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received	
	s. of the definied copies hol	TOOLIVOU.	
Attachment(s)			211
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) $\square$ Interview	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)	Informal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 3772

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brantigan '915 in view of Johnson '229

Brantigan discloses in figure 6 an implant comprising a body 11, having a leading end, a trailing end, and a mid-longitudinal axis (fig. 6), at least one surface projection 11c, extending from the exterior surface of the implant, the implant is a spinal implant, the threading end of the implant is adapted to be wholly contained within the implant space (fig. 3) and the body includes at least one opening (the openings are formed by 11c) and the body includes a hollow interior (fig. 6) that is in communication with at least one opening 19. However, Brantigan doesn't disclose the at least one surface projection being configured to resist backward rotation. Brantigan '915 does teach in figure 9 a spinal implant having threads 33b. However, these threads don't disclose an anti-rotational configuration. Johnson teaches in figure 1-32 an implant 10, comprising threads 14 that are configured to prevent rotation (locking threads). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the threads as taught by Johnson could be substituted for the threads as taught by Brantigan in order to prevent the implant from coming unfasten from the vertebrae.

Art Unit: 3772

Claims 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims above, and further in view of Brantigan 757.

Brantigan teaches in figures 1-5 a spinal implant comprising at least one opening 24, that interrupts surface projections 23, the surface projection is a tab 23, the surface projection is interrupted by openings 24, fusion promoting material that is bone 26 and the surface projection is blunt (the flat side of 23 is blunt). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the openings that interrupts the surface projections as taught by Brantigan '757 could be incorporated into the spinal implant disclosed by Brantigan in order to use the opening to allow tissue and bone to grow into the implant. The surface projections as taught by Brantigan could be substituted for the threads disclosed by Brantigan '915 and taught by Johnson because the blunt side of the surface projections would prevent the implant from coming out the vertebrae. As for the thread being twisted, that is a design choice that was not indicated as being critical in the specification.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-4972. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 am-4:00 pm Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on 571-272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/740,747 Page 4

Art Unit: 3772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

M. Brown May 27, 2007

> MICHAEL A. BROWN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mb m